

From: [Sivak, Michael](#)
To: [Mitchell, Tanya](#); [Clemetson, Michael](#); [Mishkin, Katherine](#)
Subject: RE: Rolling Knolls
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 3:35:00 PM

Tanya,

It seems like much of the 1,4-dioxane data – especially in GW – is rejected (qualified as “R”). Do we know why so many results for this analyte were rejected? I didn’t see a trip report or any information that would explain this. I’m curious because I don’t remember that chemical as present in the earlier sampling, although we may not have known to look for 1,4-dioxane back when the earlier GW sampling was conducted, and 1,4-dioxane definitely presents some remediation challenges.

Thanks.

Michael Sivak
212.637.4310

From: Mitchell, Tanya
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 2:49 PM
To: Clemetson, Michael; Sivak, Michael; Mishkin, Katherine
Subject: FW: Rolling Knolls

Please find attached the revised tables which have added highlight to results that exceed the NJDEP criteria.

Thanks,
Tanya